



comes and mail
BOX AF

AF/270 off 11
a/f
2/14/03
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2600

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

First Named
Inventor : Daniel S. Venolia et al.

FEB 12 2003

Appln. No.: 09/421,710

Technology Center 2600

Filed : October 20, 1999

Group Art Unit: 2654

For : METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR
DISPLAYING SPEECH RECOGNITION
PROGRESS

Examiner: A.
Armstrong

Docket No.: M61.12-0144

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Commissioner for Patents
BOX AF
Washington, D.C. 20231

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, THIS

3rd DAY OF February, 2003
Theresa M. Moyer
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on December 3, 2002 in which claims 1-33 were rejected.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner maintained the rejections provided in the preceding Office Action. Applicants' response to those rejections remain the same and are repeated below for the sake of completeness. The Final Office Action also included a response to arguments made by the Applicants on September 25, 2002.

In the response to Applicants' previous arguments, the Examiner asserted that because VanBuskirk provides a volume meter with a moving ribbon or a thermometer type display to illustrate the volume level of speech received in a speech recognition system, it reads on "a progress meter that quantitatively indicates the amount" as found in the claims. Furthermore, the Examiner asserted that Rozak teaches displaying speech recognition

status information using graphical and textual feedback, where the feedback can indicate a state of processing of the audio input by the speech recognition system.

Thus, the Examiner appears to be combining the quantitative indication of volume provided by VanBuskirk with the general idea in Rozak that a state of a speech recognition system should be provided to the user.

Applicants note that this interpretation of VanBuskirk and Rozak still does not teach the present invention. In particular, neither VanBuskirk nor Rozak teach a manner in which a progress meter that quantitatively indicates the amount of progress in decoding a speech input could be displayed. In VanBuskirk, the quantitative amount of the volume is easily displayed by selecting a maximum volume to be expected, and displaying a ribbon based on the ratio between the current volume and the maximum volume. However, neither VanBuskirk nor Rozak show a way to set a maximum value to indicate the progress in decoding a speech input. In particular, neither reference shows how to determine how large to make the progress meter at any point in time or how to change a progress meter over time so that it quantitatively shows the progress in decoding a speech input. Without such teachings, it is not clear how such a progress meter can be formed.

In addition, there is no indication in either Rozak or VanBuskirk that the two display systems should be combined. In particular, there is no suggestion in either reference for taking the quantitative measurements of volume provided by VanBuskirk and combining them with the state information shown by Rozak. Without at least some suggestion, it would not be obvious to select just the quantitative display aspect of VanBuskirk and combine it with the state display shown in Rozak. The fact that neither reference suggests quantitatively showing the progress of decoding indicates that such a combination is not obvious to those skilled in the